

*AB*



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,026	07/10/2001	Suhayya Abu-Hakima	8303/3	9283

7590

08/24/2005

Baniak Pine & Gannon  
Suite 1200  
150 North Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

HANNE, SARA M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2179

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/902,026

Applicant(s)

ABU-HAKIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Sara M. Hanne

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8 and 11-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

PD

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is responsive to the amendment received 6/23/05. Examiner notes pending claims 1, 4-8 and 11-16.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Claims repeatedly recite the limitation "said display" throughout despite the fact that the independent claims both now recite "an electronic display" There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Applicant is required to amend the claims for consistency

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 11-12 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Millier et al., US Patent 5899995, hereinafter Millier.

As in Claims 1 and 8, Millier teaches an electronic document viewer system for personalized presentation to a user of a plurality of electronic documents input from a source, said system comprising: a concept recognizer component configured for recognizing concepts, themes and sub-concepts, sub-themes associated with content of documents (ref. 230 Feature Recognizer), a user preferences knowledge base comprising preferences information personal to said user (Fig. 2B, ref. 240), a prioritization analyzer component configured for ordering the recognized concepts, themes and sub-concepts, sub-themes with the documents associated therewith, according to priorities of the user determined from the preferences information (Col. 4, line 10 et seq.), a viewer component configured for presenting on an electronic display a first hierarchical level of multiple levels of prioritized concept identifiers interlinked according to a hierarchical structure based on ordering (Fig. 2A), wherein each concept identifier represents the documents associated therewith and a concept, theme, sub-concept, sub-theme (Col. 5) and for presenting on the display one or more in turn (Col. 6, line 10) lower hierarchical levels of the hierarchical structure of prioritized concept identifiers upon selection thereof by the user from a concept identifier presented on the display (Col. 5, line 55 et seq.).

As in Claims 4 and 11, Millier teaches an input document processing component configured for outputting a static document map corresponding to the input electronic documents (Col. 3, line 48 et seq.).

As in Claims 5 and 12, Millier teaches a highlighter component configured for identifying key content of said input document on the basis of said document map (Col. 3, line 60 et seq.).

As in Claims 15 and 16, Millier teaches The viewer component configured for selectively presenting on the display, upon selection of one of the concept identifiers by the use, the next lower hierarchical level of concept identifiers (Col. 5, line 55 et seq.).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 6-7 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Millier et al., US Patent 5899995, hereinafter Millier, and further in view of Hyatt, US Patent 6678602.

In reference to Claims 6 and 13, Millier teaches identification of key content within an input document and creation of a static document map for creating a hierarchical configuration based on user's priorities and identified concepts (see rejections *supra*). While Millier teaches the viewer system and method for creating the hierarchy, recognizing concepts and themes, creating document maps and identifying key content, Millier fails to show displaying a predetermined amount of key content for a

Art Unit: 2179

document corresponding to the particulars presented by the viewer component when a cursor operated by a user is positioned in the area of the particulars as recited in the claims. In the same field of the invention, Hyatt teaches a hierarchy configuration method similar to that of Millier. In addition, Hyatt further teaches displaying a predetermined amount of data for the node with which the cursor position corresponds ("provide a supplementary 'bubble' of information on the display when a mouse cursor is positioned on a node of interest", Column 13, lines 26-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Millier and Hyatt before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the viewer system and method for creating the hierarchy as taught by Millier to include the proximity selection of nodes to display a given amount of key data of Hyatt, in order to obtain a preview for a node document that may be in consideration by the user. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because a method for previewing the information without opening the document would have been obtained so as to determine whether or not the user is interested in the document, as taught by Hyatt.

In reference to Claims 7 and 14, Millier teaches a concept learner component that creates new knowledge pertaining to the user based on data sensed from the system's environment for input to a knowledge base of user data (Column 3, lines 18 et seq.).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-5, 8 and 11-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The prior art reference cited above, Millier et al., US Patent 5899995, more clearly anticipates the newly amended claims.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara M. Hanne whose telephone number is (571) 272-4135. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am-4:00pm, off on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WEILUN LO can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

smh

  
BA HUYNH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER